REMARKS

Claims 1 – 8, 10, 18, 20 – 30 and 32 – 45 remain in the application.

Claims 21 – 25, 27 and 36 – 40 are allowed.

Claim 26 depends from allowed claim 25 and was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2. Claim 26 has been amended to overcome that rejection and is now in condition for allowance.

Claims 12 and 13 were indicated to be allowable subject to being rewritten in independent form. Claim 12 has been rewritten as claim 41, and claim 13 is now claim 42. Claims 41 and 42 are in condition for allowance.

Claims 14, 15 and 16 have been rewritten and amended as new claims 43, 44 and 45.

With claims 21–27 and 36–42 being allowed or in condition for allowance, and claims 9, 11–17, 19 and 31 being cancelled, the claims remaining for consideration are claims 1–8, 10, 18, 20, 28–35 and 43–45.

Claims 1–6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C.§103(a) on U.S. Patent No. 2,154,310 to Kinnard taken with U.S. Patent No. 5,191,171 to Bordwell. The manner in which the Examiner is construing claim 1 to make this rejection is not understood. The claim recites grooves having a groove depth at both a tangent location and an opposite location. The complete absence of a groove cannot be construed to be a groove and the complete absence of any groove depth (zero depth) cannot be construed to be a groove depth. The recitation of grooves and groove depth requires the existence of grooves and groove depth and cannot be read on the complete absence of a groove or groove depth. Nevertheless, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the minimum groove depth is greater than zero in the event that the Examiner is unreasonably construing the claim language to read on the complete absence of any groove or groove depth at the hinge 46 of Bordwell.

Claim 1 recites three circular grooves for three knockouts as having a common first depth at a tangent location, and a second depth that is greater than the first depth at a location opposite from the tangent location. As noted by the Examiner, Kinnard has the greatest depth at the tangent location.

Bordwell 5,191,171 has knockouts that are completely severed from the box wall. Because the knockouts are completely severed, Bordwell requires a web 46 to connect the inner knockout with the box wall. As indicated in lines 53 – 56 of column 2:

> "Single web 46 defines the **sole** connection between inner knockout 20 and the box wall, and the remaining periphery of inner knockout 20 is completely severed from the box wall and from outer knockout 30."

Kinnard provides knockouts (also called "breakouts" by Kinnard) that are removable by striking them with a hammer:

> "The breakouts 41 are formed by cutting or casting circular grooves 42 in the walls of the box 12 so that a blow from a hammer or other suitable implement will serve to break out the disc 41 and form a conduit-receiving opening where desired." (lines 45-50, pg. 2, left column)
>
> "Since the material under the groove 42 is weaker than that under the other grooves, a blow struck within the area bounded by the groove 42 will break out the disc 41 and leave the rest of the box intact. Likewise, a blow struck within the area between the grooves 42 and 43 will break out a larger disc and leave the surrounding portion of the wall intact." (lines 61-68, pg. 2, left column)

The Bordwell knockouts are removable by manipulation, grasping with pliers and twisting, and the inner knockout must be removed before the outer knockout can be removed. See lines 24 – 41 in column 4. The suggestion in lines 41 and 42 of column 2 that the knockouts could be removed by other procedures provides no insights into what other procedures might be available, and none are apparent. The presence of Bordwell's web 46, 50 and 52 makes it impossible to remove the knockouts simply by striking a hammer blow as in Kinnard.

The references themselves provide no motivation, suggestion or teaching whatsoever to a person of ordinary skill in the art that there would be any reason to add the Bordwell web 46 to Kinnard. That would just make removal of the Kinnard knockouts more difficult.

Because the art provides no motivation, suggestion or teaching for the addition of the Bordwell web 46 to Kinnard, the Examiner has made up a reason out of thin air – "to allow the knockouts to hinge instead of being completely removed." There is no reason why a skilled person would want the Kinnard knockouts to hinge instead of being completely removed. The only purpose of the openings created by removal of the knockouts is to connect conduits with the box, and the conduits cannot be connected while a hinged knockout is still connected with the box.

The teaching of Bordwell is to completely sever the knockouts from the box wall and leave the knockouts connected by a web. There are no grooves. There is no reason why a skilled person would adopt the Bordwell web 46 for use in Kinnard while ignoring Bordwell's teaching of completely severing the knockouts from the box wall. Bordwell's complete severing of the knockouts and providing attaching webs go hand-in-hand, and there is no reason why a skilled person would adopt the Bordwell web 46 for use with knockouts provided by grooves as in Kinnard instead of being completely severed.

Claims 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) on Kinnard and Bordwell, and when further considering U.S. Patent No. 6,765,147 to Weiss et al. The claims recite the screwdriver slots as being in the plane outer surface of the knockouts opposite from the tangent location of the grooves. Weiss et al molds a large projection 30 centered on the outer surface of a knockout and provides an opening in the projection for receiving a screwdriver tip to facilitate removal of the knockouts by twisting.

The Weiss patent might be relevant if the claims recited the extremely broad concept of providing a recess for receiving a screwdriver tip, but they do not. The art does not provide a motivation, suggestion or teaching to provide Kinnard with the specific type of screwdriver slot that is claimed and in the location that is claimed. The Weiss et al tool receptor 30 could not possibly be provided on each of the three knockouts in Kinnard.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) on Kinnard and Bordwell, and when further considering U.S. Patent No. 4,750,411 to Eversole. Eversole does not teach or suggest revising Kinnard by making all of the Kinnard grooves of the same depth opposite from the tangent location. Kinnard requires different depths for the grooves to insure that the outer grooves will not be displaced when the inner groove is struck to remove same. Making all of the Kinnard grooves the same depth opposite from the tangent location would completely defeat Kinnard's purpose, and there simply is no reason whatsoever for doing so.

The recitation in claim 10 that the groove depth is less than the wall thickness around at least 75% of the groove circumference is from page 5, lines 21-23, which provide that the areas of increased weakness, such as slots all or nearly all of the way through the wall, occupy not more than 25% of the groove circumference.

Claims 18 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) on Kinnard taken with U.S. Patent No. 6,672,389 to Hinrichs. Hinrichs teaches a pressure activated rupture disc that is not completely severed when it ruptures. See lines 11–16 of column 5. There is no reason why a person of ordinary skill in the art would want to provide Kinnard with a disc arrangement that is designed to prevent the disc from being completely severed from the wall of the Kinnard box. Claim 18 has been amended to include recitations that are not remotely suggested by the references.

Claims 28–35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) on Kinnard taken with U.S. Patent No. 5,444,183 to Gehrs. Claim 28 has been amended to include recitation of the weakened area of the groove that facilitates removal of the knockout from the wall. This arrangement is particularly useful with a plastic box as claimed, and there is no teaching, suggestion or motivation to provide Kinnard with any weakened area as claimed.

Claims 43–45 (rewritten claims 14–16) were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) on U.S. Patent No. 6,672,389 to Hinrichs. Claim 43 recites the weakened area within the groove to facilitate removal of the knockout. Hinrichs would not want any further weakened area because it would interfere with operation of his disc which requires rupturing at the minimum depth location along 62, 66 in FIG. 7. Weakened areas in other locations would completely destroy the Hinrichs teachings and make operation of the disc erratic.

In the absence of more pertinent art, this application is now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

H Duane Switzer

H. Duane Switzer
Reg. No. 22,431
Jones Day
North Point
901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44114-1190
216-586-7283

Date: April 19, 2007